

April 30, 1975

not wait until Final Reading. There are worthwhile things in the bill like the provision that allows the dependents of ADC recipients to be claimed for the purpose of the refund. That, in itself, would justify passage of the bill but I also think total justice demands that this amendment remain in the bill.

PRESIDENT: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I did not support the adoption of the Barnett amendment the other day. There were some who asked me why I did not and the assumption was, since a portion of my Legislative District involves people who pay a city sales tax but could not be reimbursed because they were not residents of the city was my reason. That was a concern but those individuals come out the same whether this amendment is retained or rejected. My principle concern was that the adoption may result in the entire bill being killed, and for that reason, I did not support it. But I have changed my mind. Now I am ready to support the bill. I want to see the Barnett amendment remain. I have become convinced by observing this body the last few days that there is no genuine concern about increasing property tax and the only argument I have heard against the Barnett amendment is that it is going to increase the property tax in those cities that are affected. I agree that if food tax or if the tax on food is not to exist and it is not to exist by virtue of the food credit, then it should be extended to include the sales tax on the 1% collected by the city. So it would be my hope now, since this amendment has been adopted, that it remains a part of the bill and I think it is proper and I think it is just, as has already been said, and the only impact it has is it might increase the property tax a little but I don't think most of the Legislature worries too much about that, apparently. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Senator Swigart.

SENATOR SWIGART: Mr. President and colleagues, I think, ladies and gentlemen, this whole thing boils down to whether or not there was a moral commitment. I am convinced that there was a moral commitment on the part of the state when they imposed the sales tax to begin with. It was very clear all across the state but I want to tell you something. I was there when the City Council of Omaha came down and asked the State House Legislators to give us 1/2%, a total of 1% but 1/2 of it was to go on one year, sales tax. I was there and there was no commitment whatsoever. Not one councilman said that he would propose nor recommend a reduction in the way of a rebate to the people on the sales tax. There was no commitment and I went, on the day that this amendment was put on, a week ago, the Barnett amendment, I went down to talk to Mayor Schwartzkopf that very noon and I said, Mayor Schwartzkopf, did you or did your council make any commitment or indicate in any way that you would make a rebate on the food tax, if you got a sales tax in effect in the city of Lincoln, and he said, in no way, in no way. There was no commitment. That's what counts. We should keep our commitments and I am for raising the return to the people on the part of the